

REGARDING REFORMS IN THE STATUTE (internal document for MAC)

The following document expresses my opinion regarding a number of issues related to the existing statute ratified in 9/11/2021 in the first congress, my argumentation for the reform of some parts of it, and thus my relative proposal for amendment.

The parts i wish to address are three:

First, the politburo and its qualities, second, the non-mac mod team in our organs, third some things regarding our goals.

To start with the Politburo, the existing statute orders for it to have at minimum 3 members. This in practice did not work for the following reason: Sadr resigned, and there was none to replace him; the rest of our organization's members were already in leadership positions, and the other older ones did not wish to have a leading positions; the rest were all new in the organization and such a position could not be given to them back then naturally. In practice, the politburo consisted of me and Vince, with the defacto inclusion of Firaas and Monokli when needed.

Thus, the standing statute part is the following:

The PB needs to present to each general meeting a report of its activities to the MAC. The PB minimum membership is 3 people and there needs to always be an odd number.

My proposal is to amend this to the following:

The PB needs to present to each general meeting a report of its activities to the MAC. The PB minimum membership is 2 people. In the event that the number of the politburo is even, and in the event that a a majority for a decision within the politburo does not exist, the Coordinators will have a voting

power regarding the issue. If an agreement is again not reached, the issue will go for a general voting.

Now regarding the mods. First we need to recount why we decided to adopt this system in the first way. The system was adopted before the MAC was a thing. It was in fact, a precursor to the MAC, in the mind of having a collective leadership for the subs. Now that the organization has outgrow the subs, it makes no sense for unrelated people to have any say at all, it does not make sense for there to be general votings out of MAC, and it does not make sense for us to give power to people unrelated to the organization, and at times, opposing us.

I want to clarify that it would be a mistake to say that the original system did not work: in fact, it did, and this is how we arrived to MAC. In this logic, i wish to correct anyone who thinks that the system did not work and this is why i am proposing to ditch it. I am proposing to ditch it because in my opinion is obsolete, and us keeping an obsolete system will indeed make more wrongs to us than right. The system had a purpose, the purpose is fulfilled, the most active of the mods banded together and formed an organization, the original purpose of the system is already fulfilled since long ago.

In this manner, my proposal is to not amend anything regarding the mods, but to outright remove the parts regarding them.

In my opinion, there is no point officializing anything regarding their status, and what we should do after the congress (and if this proposal passes) is for the leadership (PB and Coordinators) to formulate a plan on this removal. What i mean by this is the following: if

people wish to help us, but do not wish to join MAC (or if we don't want them to join MAC for our own reasons), but they still wish to help with work, we could make a group chat with them and whoever wishes to join in this from MAC. These people will have mod rights, but they won't be acting independently, but only according to our command. This may be also a way for them to be finally recruited within MAC if they and we wish so (i.e., this process could also serve as a filtering for them).

Nothing of this is permanent of course, since the next politburo may wish to either officialize this, or return to the old (now current) state of things in the future.

In short, i think that this is the best way for us to incorporate the non-mac people who may wish to work with us, while also not giving them any de jure and defacto power.

To this the issue of the lines is tied up: i also propose for us to abolish the current form of the lines, and officialize them in the site in forms of official documents, them having a grade higher of the announcements which do not need the general vote. Contrary to the announcements, the general votes for lines will need to have a general vote within MAC, and the debate process if needed prescribed in the decision regarding Internal Debate. The status quo regarding the upholding of the Lines remains.

In the light of this, to finish, i propose the removal of mod related writings from the statute, and adding a new chapter regarding the lines which will be the following:

LINES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The lines are official declarations on various issues from MAC. MAC members are enforced to follow the line in public. If a MAC member is suspected that they do not follow the line in public, they can be brought in "trial" from the leadership and be charged with a penalty ranging from reprimanding, temporary suspension, or outright removal. The leadership has the responsibility to properly explain in what way a X member broke the line. The line can always be removed, amended, e.t.c upon the process of its original adoption. The adoption of a line has the following steps: formulation -> debate (if any) and amendment (if any) -> general vote -> adoption.

The #documents must be used, and if asked by even one MAC member, further explanation by the the person/persons who proposed the formulation of the line, or its amendment or removal.

The announcements are a lever down from the lines, since they do not require a general MAC vote, but the approval of the PB. Of course, while done in behalf of the MAC, they dont bind in the same way the entirety of MAC in public, for this reason. A MAC member has the right to express themselves contrary to the announcement with coherent argumentation and respecting internal secrecy (i.e to not reveil much information regarding the internals of the MAC in public while expressing their disagreement) in public, and if they wish "break" the announcement by proposing an

adoption of a line contrary to the announcement. In short, if we could put them on a pyramid, a line always is above the contents of the announcement. An announcement cannot break an existing line.

If this part passes, i propose that the peculiarities regarding where to put the lines e.t.c (i.e the non essential parts) to be let to the PB to fix.

To close, i also propose the following ammentmenet regarding this part of the Statute: he strategic goals of the the MAC are, first to expand its influence, its platforms, its organs, and secondly hopefully the creation of a multinational affiliation of proletariat revolutionary organizations, with, again hopefully, the aim of the creation of national parties. The above goals may take some time, but it is the strategic goals for our organization, especially in post- socialist nations where communist organization, parties, and propaganda organs and platforms hardly exist.

To the following:

The strategic goals of the the MAC to expand its influence, its platforms, its organs and secondly help create or expand existing organizations out of the MAC, even if lightly. The above goals may take some time, but it is the strategic goals for our organization, especially in post- socialist nations where communist organization, parties, and propaganda organs and platforms hardly exist.

To explain my argumentation regarding the removal of us removing the part about creating a party, i wish to split my argumentation in two parts: first, on why it is impossible to form a party from the MAC. As you all know, the MAC does not have a national basis. It is an organization that consists of multiple people from

multiple nations, continents, e.t.c, thus it is obvious that a party cannot be created from this organization. A party has a goal of taking power in a given state or nation (or creating a state for a nation), and this cannot be the case for our organization for this obvious reason. Secondly, even if we managed to commission a MAC member in a X country to create a party, MAC can practically have no say in this party, since parties work by internal elections e.t.c. In short, the other party members may oust our MAC member and thats it. At best, the MAC member who would also be a member of this party, can spread our line. But this is within the scope of our strategic goals of expanding influence, so not much to be said regarding this.

One addition could be made to this. One would ask "ok, so why not officialize the role of the X member on spreading the line?". My answer this that is impossible to bind anyone on this, it will be like asking our member to chose between our organization and their party, and we do not wish ton have them chose on two things that cant be compared. What happens if for strategic purposes, our member cannot spread the overly radical lines of the MAC? Remember, MAC has the luxury (and responsibility) to be overly radical because it is in fact an organization consisting of thinking intellectuals, who dont put much at state besides their free time and mental labour. A party member may put their own bodies and lives on the line, and at times they dont have this luxury. Should we bare anyone from entering MAC for this? Lets give examples:

Nyan who works in Myanmar cannot possible copy cat

our lines and spread them in Myanmar by force, precisely because Myanmar has specific material conditions of its own which while theoretically the MAC lines can be used for it, in practice it would require Nyan to potentially die for nothing, while he could more if he kept silent regarding some things (one of them is the fixation of MAC on the national question and the labour aristocracy). As far as Nyan is concerned, if the social-fascists in America send him money for him to use for his revolutionary activity, he does not care. If Nyan followed in open the MAC line, the Social-Fascists themselves would not wish to even send him money for anything, in fact they would be publishing announcements on why Nyan is a fascist deserving US bombardment.

This is just an example, and i bet a similar theoretically example can be constructed for each one of us.

Our clandestine organization, which our names arent known in public, has its powers, but has its limits. A clandestine organization is based on "secret" internal politics, binding each other by trust and mutual agreement on X and Y stuff, but it cannot make us "force" anyone into agreeing. The best we can do is remove people from the organization, this is the highest penalty. Thus, we will be asking comrades to be removed from the organization, essentially going against our principle of growing influence. To grow influence by forceful means one needs to have the means for it, and we dont. In short, we dont have an army to shoot deserters, we dont have a state to give fines to offenders of the line, we dont have cards to threaten people to comply. It will be very hard to grow in influence if we remove our influential in

their nations members for not following the line in their nations for X and Y reasons.

At long last, a wish to give a further addition: this is the right to call for a motion of no Confidence. This vote can be called each 2 months. The minimum signatories for this proposal needs to be 3 members, and for the vote to pass, they need to have 50% of no confidence votes from the MAC. If the vote of no confidence passes, new elections will be held for the leadership positions immediatly.

To articulate it on how i wish to put it in the statute:

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE

One of the primary rights of the members to check the leadership if they suspect the leadership is working against the interests of the organization or it is corrupt. In case the congress (and thus, the elections) may be late, the members have the right to call for this vote if they have at least three signatories from the MAC. The vote can take place no shorter from two months since the last vote of no confidence, since members could abuse this right for X or Y reason. The PB keeps the right to dissolve the leadership and announce new elections if for some reason they feel that even if they keep majority in the votes, the minority against them is large enough and needs to be addressed. A vote of no confidence cannot be given individually for PB

members, but collectively for the entirety of PB. A vote for no confidence is given individually only to the Coordinators. If there is no replacement for the leaders if the vote passes, they return to their original position. In short, members proposing this vote need to be ready to take the seat in case their vote passes.

That is all my proposals for the statute upon the congress. For the MAC members, vote separately for each part:

- 1) Regarding the PB
- 2) Regarding the mods e.t.c
- 3) Regarding the strategic goals additions and removals
- 4) Regarding the vote of no confidence

Francesko U. Kuqe, 18/3/2022



